THE RELIGIOUS DEBATE. THE MOST REMARKABLE DISCUSSION IN OUR REL GI UN HISTORY CONTINUED.

The School of Briggs, Potter and Abbett Essentially Unchristian.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUS-Sir. I think all men of consistent thought, whether they belong to the distinctly religious or clearly rationalistic schools of belief, must thank you for the good work you have been doing for consistency of thought and creed, whether a man speak as a Christian or as a rationalist. The exposure you have been making from time to time in your editorial pages of the fallacies and inconsistencies of the new school of religio-rationalistic mongreis is a logical and a public duty well done, for which I, as as a rationalist, want to thank you. I can respect any man of consistent ideas, whether he is a religious believer or rational unbeliever, but I have no respect, either moral or intellectual, for a mongrel-mind who, while avowing every logical principle of disbelief, est insists on posing as the real true believer; and it is time that the utmost logical rid cule was brought to hear on these men, as you have been so ably doing, so that they can be got to a real zation of their ridiculous and destructive position. And if they have really ceased to be believers in the essentials of logical and historie Christianity, they should no longer pose as spokesmen of that creed, and if they have become rationalists, they should no longer insist on keeping on the fading disguise of Christianity.

These men not only pose as good Christians. but insist on occupying Christian pulpits, yet give utterance to doc rines utterly opposed to every principle of logical and historic Christianity. Not only this, but they appear to be quite destitute of any louical or consistent belief in religion as a "revealed" or divinely organized and directed system, and are wholly "pagan" or rationalistic in their attitude of mind, making nature and reason entirely supreme, and not "grace," "faith," or inspired

Indeed, not only do these men act like "in tell ctual cowards," as you have so holdly and truly said, but they also seem to act like intellectual simpletons and hybrids, for they are seemingly unable to distinguish or recognize the essential principles of different creeds or schools of thought, and are unwilling to arrange themselves honestly and logically where they properly belong. Witness such men as Briggs, Potter and Abbott rutting themselves in a purely rationalistic position with regard to the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, viz.: that they are to be treated just the same as any other works of human literature, to be regarded as inspired only in the same way as Shakespeare or Homer, subject to the some errors and faults found in all human work, and while con-taining in some sense somewhere some word or revelation of God, this is only to be found out and determined by each man for himself by the exercise of his free and untrammelled reason, which is thus made the sole judge of the "revelation." Now, it is needless to say that this is not logical and historic Christianity and never was. It is the position of rational-ism and pagan pholosophy, pure and simple, is, a basis of nature, free thought and supremacy of reason, as opposed to the idea of supernatural interfer-ence, inspired authority and acceptance by "faith." Yet these men seem to be such intellectual simpletons, or intellectual cowards as you have termed them, that they are not able to see this nor consistent enough to avow it and range themselves openly in the ranks of rationalists where they clearly belong; but, instead, they continue in the ministry of a Church whose doctrinal foundations they are doing everything to destroy. One of these men, and probably the most able and intellectual of the lot, had the good grace or sense to resign from the pastorate of a nominally Christion Church, but whether this act was prompted by a realization of his anomaly in such a post-

tion is a question.

Now, if we were logically to analyze the belie's of most of these mongrel Christians, it would be extremely difficult to tell way they ever could have the intellectual face to call themselves Christians in any true logical of historic sense at all, since so far as the percerned, they would be found to have really no greater conception of him than any good Jew or Moham medan always had, and even much less o a crystical belief about him than any good Buddhist or Hindoo would readily con feas to have. Again, when we come to analyze the basis of their ethical ideas and their test or determination for truth, we find that they are founded entirely in nature and reason, exactiv as are the pagan philosophies taught from Epicurus or old to Spencer of to-day, and no different from what is now taught and has been for thousands of years taught by the followers of Buda, Confucius and other Oriental phi phies and from what was also taught by the Stoles of Greece and Rome If, therefore, these religious rationalists are entitled in any sense rank themselves as Christians, we have the reductional absurdant that we could just as well call the Jaws, and Mohammedans, the Buddhists and Confucianists, the Stoles and Epicureans Christians also, for all these sects believed just as much or more of what is historical Christianity as do these pseudo

"Christians." There is a milder type of hybrid which is represented by the advanced Unitarians like Dr. Savage, with whom you have been having a little controversy of late, and while much more consistent and outspoken in their ration aliam, they yet appear to think that they are quite entitled to class themselves as Christians, while really believing no more about Christ or Christianity than any Jew or Mohammedan does, and no more of Christian philosophy than any of the rational pagans did. Indeed, Dr. Savage, in a recent sermon, seemed to quite flatter himself that his sect, as a Christian sect, "arbiter" in the present vital crisis in the Protestant half of the Christ an world, as in shown by the Briggs-Potter-De Costa controversy. Dr. Savage holds that De Costa is absolutely right as a logical Christian, and Potter an ! Briggs at solutely wrong, and sure to prove wreckers of the entire Protestant edifice. He also holds that there are no logical alternatives n this dilemma but "Rome or Reason," in all of which conclusions. I, as a rationalist, most heartily agree with him. But when he assumes that modern Unitarianism represents any branch of Christianity or is entitled to pose as such. I entirely disagree with him. Unitarianism is no longer 'Un tarianism" in a Christian sense, but practically pure rationalism, and the sooner it declares itself such the better it will be for consistency and honesty in thought The Unitarianism of Dr. Savage and others of his school is no way different in logical basis and elaboration from the pagan schools of Arisotle and the Stoles, which are also practically identical with the philosophy of Confucius and the evolutionary philosophy of to-day. The fact is that all our advanced thought to-day is nothing but a won-lerful revival of pagan thought and philosophy of the best schools put ing Nature and Beason as the sole and only sources of authority and arbiters of truth

You have very logically pointed out to Dr Savage his fallacy of posing as a Christian on a basis of pure reason and that he cannot maintain the dostrines of the Christian religion, not even the simple idea of a personal God, without resort to "faith" or "revelation." He seems to think, with most Christians, that a personal God is self-evident and provable by reason, but this is not so. The personal conception of God never has been believed in by intellectual races or thinkers acting on purely philosophic basis and without faith. This is a historic pholosophic fact that seems to be unknown to the average Christian. but it ought to be known to such a man as Dr. Savage. Most all the ancient pagan philosophers and almost all molern philosophers, who have thought the subject out, give up the personal conception as untenable in | &c., Max Müller, vol. II., p. 236; Cicero, Tuscul,

rational or philosophic conception. Not only is this the case with Spinoza, to whom you ave referred, but practically the case with all pure rational philosophy in the past and the Your point against Dr. Bavage is therefore, I think, absolutely impregnable

rom a philosophic and logical basis. Now, for logical consistency on the side of religion, I have to commend the letter in THE SUN of Nov. 1 from "E. P. W.," an evident Christian, showing how Dr. Savage can support his idea of a personal God and other religious ideas by faith, and only by faith. But while as a rationalist I do not believe in faith as a proper moral or intellectual ground of belief. and while it can give no rational or true cerfaith supreme or reason supreme marks off the religious man or Christian from the rationalist. If, therefore, Dr. Savage makes reason supreme, as he seems to do, and rejects faith, he should no longer in any manner or sense call himself a Christian.

I, therefore, want again to thank and commend THE SUN for its consistent and logical course in contending for these distinctions. and I want to say finally, that the real battle of our day is going to be between pure ration-niem and pure "religion" or "faith," and in this contest mongrel systems are not going to count for much. It is surely going to be a fight between "Rome and Reason" all along the line. As for Protestantism, it has practically got no more fight in it now, for in-stead of fighting it has intermarried with the enemy and has produced such hy-brids as Briggs and Abbott, &c., who will roduce themselves in another gener ation of thought. Only the pure breeds are going to survive in this struggle, as they have already survived for thousands of years. Witness the organic and doctrinal solidity of the Roman Church, on the one hand, and the undying vigor of the great pagan philosophies through all the ages on the other, philosophies now permeating all our ethical and cosm cal thought. Witness the permanency of Vadanta philosophy in Asia and the Confucian philosophy in China and the wonderful growth of the evolutionary philosophy with us, which last is nothing but a revival and elaboration of Greek and Oriental philosophy. Then compare with these the ridiculous and critical position of the hybrid system known as advanced Protestantism to-day. The essence of Protestantism has always been the authority of the Bible as distinguished from the authority of the Church, but now, with the Bible gone and Reason put in its place, what becomes of Prot-

estantism? BROOKLYN, NOV. 3. CHARLES M. HIGGINS.

Scholasticus" Replies to the Argumen

That Christianity Borrowed Immortality. TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN-Sir: Mr. Higus says: "The Old Testament does not con a paragraph which can be shown to set for a clearly the doctrine of immortality." He continues: "The Jewish literature is found to contain no clear evidence of immortality. Neither in the Old nor the New Testament do we find clear evidence of the Trinity. There fore Christians do not believe in that sublime mystery! Oh! Shades of Socrates, Plato, Aris totle, look down with commiseration on the present generation of logicians. O Sacre Socrates, ora pro nobis! Suppose a lawyer said in a court of justice: "Your Honorand gentlemen of the jury, this man Jones is not a citizen of this commonwealth. What proof have I Proof! I say so. Jones never set it forth clearly that he is or was. Therefore it is true." minutes after this harangue the jury would say to the Court: "Your Honor, we ask you to reprimand this lawyer for trifling with our in telligence, or have him committed to Bellevue for examination.

"The Hebrew is merely a nursery language compared with Greek and Latin. The Hebres could hardly have talked immo tality if he had the idea." The Hebrew language appears conrand obscure to us, for we have only one book in it. Any language would appear in the same light under similar conditions. I appeal to our Jewish friends an I Hebrew scholars as witnesses to the truth of my assertion. The Jows spoke the Phoenician innguage, surely the Phoenicians cultivated the arts and sciences. Now, according to the very best nuthorities, the most perfect language must necestaffly be the language of those nations which cultivate the arts and sciences. Hence the insinuation of ignorance against the Jews is untrue. The Phoen class were the teachers of mankind, and if they had philosophic terms the Jows must have them, too. The writings of Jeremiah, Isaiah, David and Job show a wonderfully rich and copious language. (See Jew's Letters to Voltaire, p. 531.) When the Jews had returned from the seventy years' captivity at Babylon they used the Chaldaic or Aramale language with some words. Hence it is ca'led Syro-Chaldale, the vernacular at the time of Christ. The old H-brew was practically lost during the captivity.

"Scholasticus" asks us to believe that the Jewish sect, called the Christians, got those doctrines by a divine revelation." I never said

The evidence clearly seems to be that the Christian sect got the doctrine from their neighbors." Denied. Let us have the proof. Note the word seems.

Scholasticus' may remember that it was the Magi or Persians who were interested in Christ at His birth." I assure Mr. Higgins I do not remember anything of the kind. A great many authorities say the Magi came from Chaldea. Basil asserts they came from Mesopotamia. Justin the martyr, Tertullian and Hillary affirm that they came from Arabia Felix. The Roman Catholic Church think they were kings of Ethionia, of Tharsis, of the islands of Saha and Arabia (Paal., lxxi; Isa Ix.) See Roman missal-lessons for Epiph-

"A Jew who resided in Egypt and did not get a knowledge of immortality must be very in-different or very stupid." No doubt. An Irishman who does not talk English after years in this glorious country must be very stupid. Did the Irishman talk English before coming

Mr. Higgins prefers his own "to the scholastic theory, viz., that the Jews were so stupid that only an omnipotent act could put any idea Who among the man in their heads." scholastics taught this nameless doctrine? Let us have the names of a few. The echolas iles taught that immortality of the soul can be proved by reason. They base their proof hiefly on the Aristotelian theory of cognition. Intellectual activity, said they, proves the soul immaterial, and therefore indestructible and immortal.

"Scholasticus" seems to grasp at straws when he attempts to argue that there is no Socratic Scripture, because Socrates never wrote anything." I never said anything of the kind. Proof, please. Note the word seems.

"Pinto's teachings on immortality are not the true Christian type at all, but are more nearly like those of Buddhism, if not identical with it." In another letter he states: "In the Phodo' of Plato the teachings are practically identical with the Christian belief." Now, I have already shown that the philosophy of the 'Phiedo" is Platonic, not Socratic; that the metaphysical arguments of the "Phæfo" were not those used by Socrates in prison, or at any other time; that in the "Phædo" immortality is ultimately proved by the doctrine of that Aristotle (Metaph., xii., 45) expressly tells us that the doctrine of ideas wa unknown to Socrates, and that Socrates and Plato believed in the transmigration of souls and now I accuse Mr. Higgins of omitting these important words in his quotations from Socrates, viz.: " A man of sense will not insist that these things are exactly as I have de-

"In the literature of the Persians and Hindoos, the Egyptians, the Greeks and Romans the doctrine of immortality is found." Of course it is. Bellef in it is found in all countries. In some shape or other it is confessed by all peoples (Müller, Essays, I., p. 46; Lotze, II., p. 451; Nadaillac, p. 408; Peschel, Volkerkunde, p. 270; Kuabenbauer, Das Zeugniss reason and incline to or adopt the impersonal] 1., 12, 26; Cyril, Ep. I., Ad Mont.; Mohler, Ath. or par theistle conception, which is the true 1., p. 150). Cicero advises us to consult

the most ancient authors, as they are the best on immortality. He tells us that all the ancient peoples be leved in it. Cyril said that a man who denied immortality had eaten of the root which made the reason prisoner. Plato (Tim., 2, xxii., 48; Philleb., p. 16) ascribes all his knowledge of God and the soul to the ancients, to the barbarians, viz., Chaldess, and to the Egyptian pricats. Aristotle (Met., xxii., 8) traces belief in God to the gray mists of antiquity. There is a similarity in all religions and beliefs, and hence they must have the same origin. But the divine Plato and his master were first to put philosophy on a practical basis. Hence the clearness with which they speak of immortality. It is true that Plate's doctrines of the star-soul system, the pre-existence of souls, his theory that the universe is an animal having body and soul, and his fanciful cosmogony appear absurd to us to-day, but we must not forget what Eusebius in his "Preparatio Evanalone of all the Greeks had arrived at the vestibule of truth, and stood at its very portals"; that Augustine in "City of God" expresses his admiration for his gigantic intellect, and that the name of his admirers is legion, and that the Illustrious Gia istone pours forth a flood of eloquence on the great divine whose lengthening years have been but one growing eplendor, and who at the last has left a lofty name, a light, a landmark on the cliffs of fame. The Christian apologists c'almed that Christianity was not entirely new. Its foundations are found in the Old Testament. The prophets, said they, were before Socrates and Plato, Moses before Homer. The apologists claimed that Eastern traditions, as Piate and Herodotus admitted, were the well-head of Greek wisdom, and they tried to show that the Greek philosophy came from the Old Testament. Christianity is progressive (Prudentius, perist. Symm., II. 272; Ambrose, Ep. 17-57). The Christian fathers held that the heathen had a great deal of truth mixed with error. Justin taught that all in whom the logos enered were Christians. He considered Heracittus and Socrates as Christians, and so do I The New Testament was given in the Garden of Eden, the Old on the Mount. Hence the New was before the O'd. Moreover, I believe, I hope Mr. Higgins will not be scandalized that Socrates is in heaven, for he died marter for the unity of the one true Some of the fathers claim that such men were baptized in limbo by the Apostles. Origen and Clement taught practically the same as Justin. The great Augustine (Retract, I., 13), ears that "Christianity oxisted during the interval that elapsed between the beginning of he human race and the coming of Christ, When Christ came the true religion, already existing, began to be called Christian. In fact, we see fragments of truth among all people, and her footprints on the sands of all time The truths of Christianity are found in germ in paganism. Zoronster, Buddha, Confucing and the founders of all religious communities prepared the way for Christ. Hasthanism and Judaism made straight the paths of Christianity.

"The Book of the Dead, Buddha, Confucius, Socrates and Piato taught Christian doctrines. The Book of the Dead, translated by Birch, contains 146 chapters, and I fail to see the Christian's own doctrines on immortality in them. The authors are unknown. It is simply a liturgy, not a theological treatise. The authors speak of two hostile divinities striving for the souls of the departed, and the authors evidently believed in the transmigration of souls. Forty-two deities stood by when the soul's deeds were weighed in the balance, &c. Let us have chapter and verse wherein is taught the Christian doctrine of immortality.

I have already disposed of Plato, I wish eaders of THE SUN to note that it is not very easy to say what I'late taught on some matters Philosophers are still wrangling over the question whether he ever arrived at the knowledge of the true God, whether he held ldean to be distinct entities and real existences, independent of the human mind and divine intelligence they having served as eternal patterns, accordng to which God moulded and framed everything; but there is no philosopher who dealer that Plato held the belief of the transmigration of souls. Buildha, I may observe, is a title meaning wise Buddhism is based on the assumption that human existence is a curse, n blessing, and on the doctrine of the transmigration of souls. According to Buddhist belief man is immediately born again when he dies. and he appears in a new shape, according to his merit or demerit. Some souls are placed in slaves, plants, or disgusting animals, are bora in one of the 136 Baddhist hells, situated in the interior of the earth; others are books. For those who wish to see the subject in all its phases, read Windischman, History of tory; Bumüller, Hist, of Bab.; Schlegel, Phil of Schell, Phil.: Max Müller, vol. L. p. 212; Cyclopeedia of Knowi.; and any good encyclorædia.

Confucianism doubts the existence of the next world, but lauds the present. A great many say, however, that school believed as all the Orientals be leved, viz., in the transmigration of souls. Perhaps Mr. Higgins can enlighten us, but I ask for the words in which the Christian's own doctrine is taught and the chapter and verse. Confucius tells us (J. F. Clarke, "Ten Great Religions," vol. I., p. 581 that in the West the true saint must be looked for. He was looked for there, and be came, and all the kings of the earth adored him, and kings walked in the brightness of his rising. And to-day the light shines in darkness, and

the darkness comprehends it not. But I shall grant, for the sake of argument. that Christianity borrowed the doctrine of immortality from the pagans. Surely it does not, therefore, follow that the Christian doctrine is false. The reader must remember that it is not Christianity that is on trial, but the assertions of the French encyclopmists and Voltaire. Schopenhauer and Kant, given to THE Sun's readers by Mr Higgins. Hence the objections have not even the charm of novelty Listen to that profound thinker. Schlegel "Philosophy of History." p. 134. Bohn's Trans.): "The enemies of Christianity since the time of Voltaire have not failed at the name of Bonzia to throw out many malicious epigrams against The similarity of Christianity to the religion of Fo is not real, but is that caricature resemblance the ape bears to man; for

the ape has with man no real affinity, no true internal sympathy in his organic conformation, but merely likeness of as spiteful parody, such as we may suppose an evil spirit to have devised to mack the image of God-the masterpiece of creation." Voltaire was a brilliant but superficial thinker, and I am really ashamed to see a fellow citizen of this great Republic borrowing objections from him and giving them to us home of the brave and free. Scholasticus.

A Religion Built by Intellect Rather Than

Emotion Demanded. TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN-Sir: In THE Sun of Oct. 29 I notice a request by the Rev. Dr. M. J. Savage, that "somehody would make clear this, for still it is not 'intelligible' to me: How should I know an infallible authority, even if I should see one? Would it be by a process of reasoning? If so, would not reason be, in such a case, the final court of appeal? If I do not settle the question by reason, then must I not settle it for no reason, or without a reason? If I settle it without reason, then what reason have I for settling it one way rather than some other?

Dr. Savage implies by his questions that an infallible authority might present itself in questionable shape or that it might not be easily recognized by our minds, though it come without disguise, because of the ilm.tations of our minds.

An infallible authority must be by its very nature logical. This being true, it will come the accounts in the Gospels, is crucified on

without disguise. It will of necessity have no business with minds too duli to comprehend it. Our deductions, therefore, are that when it presents itself we will recognize it by reason of its infallibility and because it could not

present itself if we could not comprehend it. That we have never come in contact with an infallible authority seems proved by two points: F rst, that what some have considered an infallible authority is proved gross'y illogical, hence not infallible; second, that, inasmuch as we know of no infallible authority. It either has never presented itself or our minds have been incapable of comprehending it, even

though it has presented itself. There is a road, it seems to me, leading to an infallible authority as yet little travelled by the mind of man. Hitherto passion has been the architect of religion. By the analysis of phenomena it has reared its structure yat the search for an infallible authority still goes on. Let now, intellect build a religion not by analysis but by synthesis. Here, I believe will begin the road leading to an infallible authority. BOSTON, Nov. 2. JOHN W. HAWRINS.

If This Life Ends All!

To the Editor of The Sun-Sir: Of great nterest has been the discussion in your liberalminded paper on immortality and, on the whole, its conclusion seems to tend to negative rather than to affirm the belief. But let us take comfort, we who desire to believe, for not the most learned, not the greatest thinker, can prove to us whether annihilation or immortality is to be ours. Spirit only can discern spirit, the living spirit can only testify of taelf.

It may be considered to be an unworth

thought that if there is not a life bey ind the grave we will permit ourselves the more en-

joyment here. But let us be truthful about it. Is it not so? We have some secret enjoyable

testre in the fulfilling of which wrong would come in somewhere, and because of that wrong even though by our fellow men it might never be known-we have refused to do it. But et some one come to us and say, "It is proved incontestably that our soul dies with the body. and our point of view is changed. "I must do this thing before I die," is the instant decision. To know limitation is to go just as far as imit allows, then to retrogress or stand still. A mother shuts her little one safely into the vard and the child runs and presses himself against the picket feace and peeps through the bars. Oh, how delightful to wander along that upward path, slimb to the very top of the hill and see what is on the other side! Oh, how tempting is that grave where there are flowers to cick, and the blue sky to see between the branches of the trees! But sooner or later he ligs contentedly in his small garden plot, or

goes to sleep on the dust heap.

Not the hope of Henven, nor the fear of hell. not the hope of reward, nor the dread of punshment, braces us to be men, and go that, but the inextinguishable inward faith that if we will we can step forward, onward upward: progress, advance, achieve. What, then, if the body die before its time, or is worn out? We do not understand a halt, for the soul is young and strong. We are children : we have only begun to learn; we wish to be full grown in mind and apirit; we have even dreamed that here, where we say "I believe," there we shall say "I know." Can we stop short of such? And what mirac's is there more in the immortality of the soul than in the pink of the rose, the golden of the oriole, the beat of the heart? Prove to us satisfactorily that we die. body and soul, and we will, consciously or unconsciously, lower our standard, if but as inch: but it cannot be proved, as little can it that the soul lives lorever, and yet so finely is man built that he will not act as if the chance were against it; he will not impede the progre-s of his higher nature; he will not duli the inward voice with indifference, nor with wan-In the poem, "Rugby Chapel," Matthew Arnold writes thus of his father:

O strong soul, by what shore surely, has not been left vain! Somewhere, surcly, afar, In the sounding labor-house vast Of being, is practised that strength, Zealous beneficent from Yes, in some far shining sphere. Conscious or not of the past, Still thou performest the word Of the spirit in whom then dost live -Prompt, unweared, as here! But fer us particularly notice the words " For

hat force." Is it imperatively necessary to immortality that here the soul be a living Follow up the thought, and are we justified in soying "I am the captain of my soul?" On the other hand, when we consider born as blessed spirits, or even divinities in the possibility of the soul's extinction, we cry one of the many heavens. This truly is not from the depths of our hearts: "O my Father, Christian. Perhaps Mr. Higgins has writings is this all '? And to such hearts comes the anof the Buddhists that I have not access to. swer. "What, my children, have not I given Give us chapter and verse and edition of the you free will, the power to choose between good and evil, the materials within you to make of life a beaven or a hell? Have I not Phil.; Von Drey, Apol.; Gfrorer, Prim. His- given you love and hate, faith and doubt, ecstas; and despair, the power to suffer and Hist.; Wiseman, Revealed Religion, vol. II.; to enjoy? Have I not given you joys of the body and brightness of the intellect? not given you music and arts, trades and sciences, inventions and discoveries, bodily agony and bodily ease? Have I not given you nature in all her richness-volcano and whirlwind, rain and annahine moonlit waters and starry nights, the flower and the forest, the tempest and the laugh of children, the tige and the song bird, the snake and the butterfly, pestilence and health, beauty and desciation—and do you say this, and infinitely more, is all"? And we ponder, and with a pang of noble shame we say, 'We are ungrateful." We attune our minds to bow to the decree; we argue: "It is well, I have enjoyed. I have suffered; and there is after all, a great restfu ness in knowing that when we die it means annihilation, the stilling forever of restless, aspiring mind and heart. It s well." But no, just as it is the exception or man not to know the deep need of a God, and, not knowing, not to seek the living God, so it is surely the exception for spiritua man not to feel the deep need of a life beronthe grave, and feeling, to believe. He it so of not, let us rather believe than not. If nothing remains at our death but the body, we shall sever know that faith and aspiration are exinguished; if, on the contrary, the soul lives continuously and is conscious of doing so, so much the more will our past bellef illumine ben, as now, the "path of advance " ELIZABETH H. BOWLE.

CENTRAL CITY, Nob., Oct. 31

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN - Sir: You and many of your correspondents have held hat a revelation from is the only proof we have of the existence of a God. Will some of them tell me where this revelation is to be found? Is it in the book or collection of books called the Bible? If so in what part of the same? Is

it in the Book of Genesia? Science tells us that

the world was postively not made in six days.

and nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son

of Man remain three days and nights in the

Your orthodox correspondents might say tha

Where is the fierelation?

these six days meant six mons of time, but doesn't the Bible say plainly that "the evening and the morning were the first day," &c. Is this the revelation that is spoken of? Or is the revelation anywhere else in that Book? Is it in the different myths and legends connected with the life of Moses? Is there anything inspiring in that story where the enake that Moses was able to conjure up by the passing of a stick through the nir, devoured all the other snakes conjured up by the representatives of different Gods than that of the Israelites, thus showing that Jehovah was the "God of Gods" Who, in these enlightened days, believes that this is a revelation from the Almighty? In this revelation in the countless stories of cruelty. rapine and murder, countenanced by Jehovah in the different books of the Old Testament, or others. is it in that beautiful tale of the children who were devoured by the wolves for the beinous crime of addressing one of the prophets of Israel by the horrible name of "baldhead"? Is this reveiation mathematically correct when

Friday and rises from the dead on Sunday? Look at the contradictions in the Gospele The positions of the angels around the sepulchre of Curist are different in every one of the Gospels. The Inscription placed over the cross when Christ was crucified is differently worded in every one of the four Gospels. All through the Old and New Testaments there are these contradictions, which I have not the time to speak of now, but they are readily noticed by even the most casual reader. Where O where, is the revelation? RATIONALIST. NEW YORK, NOv. 2.

The Truth, the Whole Truth and Nothing but the Truth.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN-Sir: The cor respondent from Trenton who recently disputed my position that religious teachers should speak what they believe, affirmed that from Newman back to David, the great men of the Church and Bible, have both practised and advocated deception. I reply, if this be true, so much the worse for the men!

The excuse for them was not only the ignorauce of the masses, but also of the classes whom they sought to influence. In these days of widespread education however, I leave it with all intelligent peop'e to decide whether they can even tolerate the thought that an instructor of any sort, and particularly a teacher of religion, is saying what he does not believe One need not be an instructor or a teacher: he may decline to affirm, repeat or recite: he may remain silent and thus "conceal from the people what he thinks they should not know.' But if he speaks he is bound, as an hones man, to speak what he thinks. As a teacher of religion he must reveal his convictions to his hearers whenever God reveals them to him. "God must look out for his own investments

and He is entirely competent to do it. Hierarchism, in Church as in State, seeing te craft in danger, always justifies itself for deception and lies. Esotericism is state-craft and priest-craft. Not the people, nor the truth, but the craft is the chief concern; and to save this, the people may be deceived and truth perverted or restrained.

In the New Testament we see how even St Peter was lead away by priest-craft. He was so influenced by that Judaizing or traditions party which has ever since held away in the Church, that he so deceived or "dissembled" that St. Paul "withstood him to the face because he was to be blamed."

As to the injunction of Jesus, cited as authority by your Treaton correspondent "Cast not your pearls before awine," it applies only to entire silence. Retain your pearls i you are sure they will be "trampled under foot." But to east out a portion of them with the pretension that you have cast out all is quite another thing. The latter is the sin of Ananias and Sapphira, "Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part; thou hast not lied to men, but unto God." Whatever subject is up for cor sideration either keep silent or else say exactly what you think "the truth, the whol truth and nothing but the truth"-is the mora of that New Testament story.

A CLERGYMAN OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCO PAL CHURCH.

NEW YORK, Nov. 2.

The Reasonableness of Christianity Assailed. To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN-Sir: Permit me to offer some considerations as bearing more directly than "Higher Criticism" upon the root of the religious discussion now going on i your paper. Christianity as it is taught must grow or de

cay on its merits. Men and women are coming more and more to the point of deading fo themselves what is right and wrong. They are no longer willing to be guided wholly by another. They are eager to learn, but refus to consider emphatic declaration as evidence. I will briefly touch on what seems to me the general or structural lines of Christianity. In the Old Testament: One God, Creator of Himself and all other things, good and evil.

Original sin: By which man, created by God, falls through the force or power of evil. If God was not solely responsible or did not know in advance exactly what would happen, it is difficult to understand wherein His Gothood lies. God having created evil and the man, is responsible for both. Propitiation: We find man now atoning for the sine charged to him, buying his way into favor, by the sacrifice of birds and beasts.

There is no attempt whatever to show these creatures had any connection with the On the contrary, they are expressly declared pure and innocent. Divine Love: We find it impossible to believe

in Go I's love-even justice, with His partisanship, His wrath and jealousy. Divine law: Without express intervention of

niracies, men and beasts are exempt from the results of incest; theft flourishes without re probation; deception has immunity; the most cruel and unjust wars and individual acts go unpunished-nay, flourish. A mere collection of human law derived from experience const tutes no vali I claim for Divine origin.

The New Testament: Here we are intro duced to Joseph, a descendant from Abraham through three times fourteen generations. Jo seph is travelling with Marr. Then for the first time we hear of the Holy Ghost. reader of simple St. Matthew can decide for himself that writer's success with the problem Nevertheless, now we have instead of one God. a Trinity, each separate, distinct, infinite beings, but still a Unity.

Original sin and vicarious sacrifice are the bases of the New as of the Old Testament With all the means at His command, God chooses to offer Himself or His only begotten Son (both or one, it is hard to say as a vicarious atonement to Himself! The manner of this atone ment is such that many sects, each claiming the true version, fought and shed much blood over technicalities. His or Their followers would keep it up did not secular law prevent. Blood: We are told that only through Christ's

death and sacrifice may we gain eternal happiness. How could an eternal being die? What sacrifice is it to say "Adleu" to the hot plains, the pain and misunderstanding of His life in Judea? "The blood of the Lamb washes away the sin of the world," is so crue! a thought that Christianity might be rejected for that reason alone.

Salvation: Faith in the foregoing will eternal reward, and the lack thereof will be punished by evernal "weeping, wailing and gnashing of testh." From Genesis to the Apocalypes, the Bible fails to reach the wisdom and justice of the librattist Gilbert, who says "Let the punishment fit the crime." It is no excuse to claim that a sin against God is infinite because the man is only finite, according to the Bible. True virtue asks no reward.

The Supernatural: Belief in the megical

and marvellous is a racial instinct with th Oriental. It is greatest where human ignorance is greatest-where human life is on the lowest plane. Can that be gainsaid? Supernatural, magical, marvellous seem, then, to mean about the same thing as ignorance The racial characteristic of the Northman is t seek a natural cause for all phenomena. He may not understand, but will never rest satisfiel with calling anything supernatural and keep his mind and hands at rest

Without any pretensions as to the final word. it seems to me that Jesus of Nazareth was a natural man in every respect, who in his vonth became possessed of the philosophy of the further East. He was endowed with extraordinary intelligence, sympathy and courage. Conceiving the importance of reform to his people. he sought to teach in the spirit of patriotism and brotherhood. He knew the result-that needed no prophetic vision-nor did it deter him. He was executed, as many men have been before and a nee him, for interfering with the usual order of things and the business of

I fail to find one word against human alayery within the covers of the Bible. Bistop Hor kins however, found in it numerous reasons for it in his book in defence of slavery.

It seems to me impossible to believe even of Jesus says: "As Jonah remained three days | the Christian Christ that He could stay three days in Hell without abolishing that institution. Or that He would be content to sit on the bowels of the earth." and then, according to | right hand of His Father or of Himself for two thorsand years, while on earth men, women

and children suffered in doubt, when one word

n Him would set them right Can "Higher Criticism" clear the points enumerated? If not, its efforts are empty and fruitless. There is no middle ground for the conest and conscientious. Unquestioning belief in the supernatural or divine origin of the Bible-its literal verity-on the one hand, and, on the other, a broad moral philosophy which seeks to carry the good in the teaching of the past to higher planes in the present.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Nov. 1. FREEMAN.

Christ and the Syro-Phonician Woman. TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN-Sir: I venture o ask through your columns from one or more of the scholars and theologians whose letters on the great questions of the proof of the existence of God and a future life give so much profit and instruction to thousands of your readers, their explanation of the positive de claration of our Saviour to His Apostles in reply to the petition of the Syro-Phonician roman: "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of Israel" (Matt. xv., 24), a declaration em phasized by His calling Israel the children and outsiders dogs, (Verse 26.)

No text in the Gospels has given to seekers and believers so much doubt and pain as this has. It has wrong the hearts of thousands who believe, or wish to believe, in the mission of Christ for the redemption of the whole human race. To me no plainer language could be used to state a limited purpose in and a restricted labor by Him. I do not overlook the set that He afterward declared that He had other sheep, not of the fold of Israel, and commanded His Gospel to be preached to all naions, but these later utterances indicate only change of purpose and a consequenct extention of His work and mission to all mankind, f His first quoted statement was correct. The whole scheme of Christian theology rests.

or is said to rest, upon the doctrins of the tonement of our Saviour, and theologians tell us that His coming and mission were intended to initio for the redemption of all men, and were foretold in numerous prophecies literilly fulfilled. If this be so how could He have *aid what He did about the alien woman? Car we imagine Him prevarienting, much less declaring what He knew to be untrue? These questions force themselves irresistibly on readngthe narrative, and in my Biblical reading (limited, I admit.) I have seen no explanation of them offered-at least none that is at all satisfactory to me. Thus, Farrar, in his "Life of Christ," suggests that the saying was uttered to try the woman's faith, but the declarawas made not to her but to the Apostles and I do not think that the arguments adranced by other scholars, that it is a thing povered by the justifiable withholding of truth rom those unable to comprehend it, is applieable. Here there was not a suppression or con cealment merely, but a deliberate assertion. TENTH NEW JERSEY.

NEW YORK, Nov. 1.

Dr. Savage's Position Supported.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN-Sir: The poition of those who in these days are assaulting the fortress of the Christian faith will no e weakened by such deliverances as that of E. P. W." in this morning's Sun. It is intolrant in spirit and patronizing in tone, and worst of all, runs in the smug, self-eatisfied vein of the "holier-than-thou." Dr. Misot J. Savage had asked how one may know an in fallible suthority even if he sees one; and the reply comes: "By faith, Doctor," may be assumed that the Doctor had heard that answer before and that it falled to satisfy him. The question reads as if it had been asked in good faith. Lut the reply seems to be fliprent, or at least inconsequential.

Dr. Savage is told that the Church will never degenerate into a society of aubtle reasoners out if we are at liberty to assume that "subtle" is not here intended as a term of reproach no teachings, not even those revered and prized as sacred, should be in danger of contamination in the company of that addiety. Faith is belief that does not ask for evidence o sustain it; it is unquestioning reliance. It cannot always be coerced, and he who says unto himself and his fellows, "I believe, I believe," has not thereby created a faith within himself. Is he not better advised who strives conscientiously to build his hope upon his reason, so that the one shall be a foundation for the other instead of a menace to it?

Your correspondent reminds Dr. Savage that whoseever shall not receive the King fom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein," and quotes it to him as one making use of a threat. The plain inference is that he Poctor has condemned himself by asking how an infallible authority may be known; and esuredly it is not charitable for the righteous man to gloat over the unrighteous one!

Dr Bavage's question is a very pertinent one, and is worthy of and hould receive pertinent instead of impertinent replies. H. A. B. BROOKLYN, Nov. 1.

Another Defender of Dr. Savage's Views. TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN-Sir: Robert Lawrence in to-day's Sux indulges in a diatribe against what he styles the "mise able apology or religion that Dr. Savage proposes for our acceptance." The interesting point in his leter is his definition of religion, which he claims, "viewed historically. . . is found to be es-sentially an affair of escaping Divine displeasure or attaining Divine favor." To emphasize he says: "Nowhere, indeed, do we find a more desperate and terrible anxiety to attain blessedness than among the Hindoos." Thus, his idea is that religion consists of a desperate and terrible anxiety to escape Divine displeas ure, and a desperate and terrible anxiety to at-

This, indeed, is a very primitive conception of religion, with its necessary implication as to the character of God, and is in striking con trast with the views of Dr. Savage, and in fact with the views of the enlightened mind of today. Conceive, if possible, of a desperate and terrible anxiety to escape Divine displeasure of attain Divine favor! Desperate means without hope; and terrible means a condition of overwhelming fear. The necessary implication as to the character of Mr. Lawrence's God is that He is a being capable of demanding that the worship He requires of His children shall be inspired by an overwhelming fear and by a hopeless anxiety to escape His Divine wrath and to attain His Divine favor.

Imagine a bully of the worst and most prosounced type, and you have point by point an exact counterpart of Mr. Lawrence's God. What desperate and terrible anxiety, to escape the sully's displeasure and to attain the buily's favor, is felt by all who are subject to his power. He has constantly a chip on his shoulder to keep his subjects in perpetual fear. We see the same spirit illustrated among animals, where the weaklings exist in a state of constant, desperate and terrible anxiety to escape the displeasure of the master of the flock or to atta n his favor. How they slink into corners and eringe out of sight!

Divine favor obtained at such a sacrifice is worse than useless; it is positively degrating and debasing to the best elements of manhood, And a God, from whose Divine displeasure escape is so utterly or wellnigh hopeless, is not the "God of Love" to whom we are pointed by the comforting words of Jesus, but is the orrible carreature of God taught by Tertullian in the second century, and by Tetzel in he lifteenth century.

If I understan i Dr. Savage's sermon aright t is singularly in accord with the teachings of Jesus as to the character and substance of God : and his religion, which Mr. Lawrence styles a 'miserable apology." is the same which Jesus taught 1,10) years ago: "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." Dr. Savage's God is the embodiment. of perfection as distinguahed from perfection in the abstract; and his religion is the effort of the human to attain perfection. On the other hand, Mr. Lawrence's God is the divine bully of the universe; and his religion is the desperate and terrible anxiety of the individual to escape the displeasure of this buily or to attain his favor. If either system is entitled to the epithet "miserable apology" I think Mr. Lawrence's is entitled to that distinction NEW YORK, NOV. 2. HARRIS A. CORELL.

KAISER'S MEDIÆVAL DREAM

WILLIAM IL TO BE SWORD OF CHRIST IN A NEW HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE

Hegemony of Old German Emperors to Be Restored by Acquisition of the Protectorate Over the Orient from the Vatican-

Dreyfus Agitation Used to Abase France. ROME. Oct. 8.-While in France, overwhelmet by the indignation of the nations, a paintal drama was being unfolded, in Germany a strong, skilful, shrewd and foreseeing policy was being carried out, of which outlines stant out in more marked relief day by day. The Kaiser's pompous pilgrimage to Jerusalem has not passed out of mind, with the openly declared object of anatching away from France her four-century-old, incomparable privilege, the protectorate.

This ambitious aim, supported by all the German Catholies and by some very variegated ethnographic groups coincided with the policy of Internal concentration with the object of pursuing a policy of conquest in foreign affairs Arbitrary and eager for glory, anti-liberal and anti-democratic, determined to subdue the rising democracy and the new currents, Withelm II. calculated that the enrolment of the Catholics in his dangerous and useless crusa is would give to the forces of the young empire an invaluable addition. To Cardinals. Archbishops, Bishops, clargy, laymen, he has tendered the olive branch, the alliance of altar and throne against the common enemy, the democracy, having in mind an eminently governmental idea, peace at home, with international power in view.

Many German Catholics, as we have seen, have preferred imperialism and conservative opportunities to the proud, fruitful, admirable independence of former days. Hence the newspaper campaign against France, against her protectorate in the East and her privileged position at Rome: hence the congivance of the German Catholics with her most implacable slanderers; hence the almost ministerial coafuct of the Catholic Centre and the determination of the socialist and conservative pelicy In the south men were more reserved and

expressed doubts as to the value of such an evolution. In the last elections to the Bavarian Landing, the Bavarian Catholics carried their independence so far as to make an offensive alliance with the Socialists against the armgance of liberalism, but along the Rhine and n the north the Centre followed Herr Lieber in his new line of conduct.

At the moment when a decision was being rendered at Rennes on the Drayfus case, the Kaiser did his best to show up the misdes is of the Republic and to preach the benefits, the virtue of the Monarchy. His speeches at Stras-burg, at Stuttgart, and at Carleruha, contained hints of reflections on France Ha subtle and wideawake mind seemed to outline a striking contrast between the republican coverament and the Prussian monarchy. At Stransburg especially his words must have ounded strangely, like a sorrow'ul knell, to the ears of the Aleatians, who have remaine faithful in the worship of their oil Fatherian!

In official editorials newspapers like the Strassburger Post, the Landeszeifung, the Allemeine Zeitung, and others of the same kind made haste to continue in service pictures the doomy rarallel. The episode is tracic.

Nor is this all. The Kniser with that art that ooks like nature, combining cold calculation with impetuosity, has allowed the secret hought of Germany to app ar in all its force. Unhesitatingly, with no fear of ridicule he proclaims himself "the only support," "the only salvation" for the Church. There is general stupifaction, there is displayance among the Catholics. The Germania and the Centre newspapers try to put down the new Lutheran Charlemagne into his proper place. Dr Schaed ler, a southern Catholic, in a sensational speech protests indignantly against the monstrous theory. These objections, however, do not remove from the speeches their political character and significance.
At Rome, where the development of the

Kniser's idea is followed attentively, his speeches have confirmed the uneasiness of those who in 1892 foresaw the whole extent of the German policy. It is known now beyond all doubt that Wilhelm II is dreaming of a sort of revival in Lutheran fashion of the Holy Roman Empire. The sovereign by instinct and by reflection is an en'ightened, persevering fanatic admirer of the ancient all ance between the priesthood and the empire, between altaand throne. He wishes to be the sword of religion, the foreign Bishops the protector of

It is no zeal for the house of God that possesses him. It is the glory of the Hohenzol'erns, the might of the Empire. For the former religious egemony of France he would like to tute the hegemony of Germany. The Pope's republican policy in France irritates him and disturbs his far-reaching and deeply laid combinations. What efforts he has made to persua!e Rome that she should "leave the republic to stew in its own gravy!" Germany has no intention of letting the Pope snarch from her "the anarchist and sectarian republic" which she brought into being or at any rate helped to bring into existence. She presses Rome close in every form and by every means to detach the Papacy from France; she makes use of every Machinvellian wife to make appearement, and the reorganization of colit cal unity in France impossible. The Dreyfus affair has provided her with a wonderful opportunity for pleating with the Vatican

and for pushing forward her mysterious outworks. The idea of begemony, the hopes for a protectorate are opposed to the tendency of Rome, to the general policy of the Papacy, and to the security of France in the world. Doubtless the erfidious and subtle machination is folled for the present by the inflexible resistance of Leo XIII., but in expectation of the coming Pore, who, it is hoped, will be more docile. Germany s preparing everywhere favorable sentiment

and accomplices. At the moment when narrow, sectarian politicians in France are calling for a policy of retaliation on the Catholics, the actions of the Kaiser are significantly eloquent and have immense intrinsic value.

Expelled from Church Because of Her Hat From the Philade phia Public Ledger

WAYNESBORO, Nov. 1. - Miss May Offer a prominent young woman of this place, wh returned from the Holy Land, has been expelled from the Antietam German Baptist Funker! Church for discarding the conventional plain bonnet for a pretty creation of the milliner's art-At a meeting of the church authorities in July, Miss Oller was notified that she must return to the wearing of the bonnet, and that she would be given until October to put away her hat. She wrote the church people, asking them to extend the time, but the authorizes at a meeting a few days ago took the matter up, and, although the defence was set forth that the annual meeting, the denomination had made the weating of a hat or bonnel discretionary. Miss Oller's expulsion was ordered by a large trajectly.

Miss Oller and her friends will appeal to the annual meeting for final determination of the matter. Miss Oller is now visiting New York. She is a daughter of the lat lishop fecoh F Oller, who was prominent in the work of the deporting on in this section, and the founder of the Gelser Manufacturing Company, the largest industurial concern in southern Pennsylvania. given until October to put away her hat. She

The Most Ancient Machine Tool. From Cassier's Magazine,

There can be very little doubt that the potter's sheel, or potter's lathe, as it is also termed. resents to day the most ancient form of machine tool known. Among the many sculptured or ords of the trades and occupations which no vivilly represent the customs and habits of the amount Egyptians, the potter and his wheel have term found frequently depicted, and it is curious is not that through the almost countless general as since that time this crude type of laths has under gone no material modification. The premises form was evidently a small round table, set of a pivot, and free to revolve, being turned by bond at intervals; and to this device there were added in the course of time such simple convenences as table to support it and a fost or a hand swer turning arrangement, displaced, in recent leaves a table to support the meditarion and the displaced in the course of the support to the leaves a table to support the leaves a table to support the leaves at leaves a table to support the leaves at leaves at leaves a table to support the leaves at leaves at leaves and the leaves at leaves at leaves at leaves at leaves and the leaves at leave ords of the trades and occupations which so vivilly